DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 033 EC 082 610

TITLE	A Review of Progress: Model Secondary School for the Deaf; The First Five Years (1970-1975). Report.
INSTITUTION	Model Secondary School for the Deaf, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[75]
NOTE	23p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Aurally Handicapped; Conceptual Schemes; *Curriculum; *Deaf; Educational Objectives; Exceptional Child Education; Needs Assessment; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *Secondary Education; Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	Gallaudet College; *Model Secondary School for the Deaf

ABSTRACT

Presented is the report of a review panel made up of educators, deaf persons, and parents of deaf children on the first five years of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf operated by Gallaudet College. Sections of the report include observations and recommendations in the following areas: the school's mission; the concept of model; the instructional program; curriculum development and design; developmental education; staff development; research and evaluation; and organization, development, and management. The committee's principal concerns fall into five areas and include that emphasis should be placed on an on-going process of needs assessment, utilizing multiple internal and external sources, as an integral part of its instructional and curriculum development program. (SB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED121033

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REPORT

A Review of Progress

Model Secondary School for the Deaf
The First Five Years (1970-1975)

EC082610

REPORT

A Review of Progress

Model Secondary School for the Deaf
The First Five Years (1970-1975)

INTRODUCTION

The Charge of the Review Panel

In 1966 the Congress of the United States enacted Public Law No. 89-695 in order to make a major assault on the persistent problems of secondary education for deaf young people. Selected as the site for the model secondary school for the deaf called for in the Legislation, Gallaudet College was entrusted with full responsibility "for the establishment and operation" of such a school. In April, 1969, as authorized by the Law, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entered into an Agreement with Gallaudet for the operation of the school. In September of that year, with the encouragement of the Congress and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a pilot program, which would be experimental in nature, was started in temporary facilities. This pilot program is now completing its fifth year of operation. During the time the pilot program has been in operation, the planning and construction of a permanent facility for the Model Secondary School for the Deaf on the Gallaudet College campus have been underway. Occupancy of the new building is scheduled for the Summer of 1976.

Because of the strong commitment of Gallaudet College to maximum educational opportunities for deaf people, and because of its desire to respond fully to the Congressional mandate as expressed in the Law and the Agreement, in January, 1975, the President of the College appointed a panel of educators, deaf persons, and parents of deaf children, to review the progress of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf

in its first five years. This Review Panel was charged with the responsibility to determine the responsiveness of Gallaudet College to both the terms of Public Law No. 89-694 and the Agreement with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to advise the Board of Directors, the President of the College, and the Dean of Pre-College Programs and Director of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf, on the extent to which the pilot program is moving in the direction intended by the Law and the Agreement. This document is the report of the Review Panel's findings and recommendations in the discharge of its mission.

The Review Process

The Review Panel met at the Model Secondary School for the Deaf (MSSD) on the campus of Gallaudet College from April 9 through 12, 1975. Its work proceeded along three principal lines: (1) An intensive review prior to the on-site visit of a wide variety of documentary evidence; (2) A visit to the School facilities, including the residence hall, with observation of the program in action; (3) Interviews with the President of the College, the Dean of Pre-College Programs and Director of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf; conferences with key staff and representative faculty of the School, and small group and personal conversations with students. Two and one half days of the on-site visit were spent in data gathering; the third day was devoted to discussion and analysis of the Panel's findings.

This report of its findings is structured along the lines of the major issues or questions examined by the Review Panel. One section of the report is devoted to each of these areas -- the Mission of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf; the Concept of Model; the Instructional Program; Curriculum Development and Design; Developmental Education; Staff Development; Research and Evaluation; and Organization, Development and Management. In each instance, observations and recommendations are offered.

The Membership of the Review Panel

George Brain, Ed.D. - Dean of the College of Education, The Washington State University, Pullman, Washington. Previously Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, Maryland.

Phyllis Harper, M. A. - Teacher in Keokuk, Iowa. Member, National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped. Parent of a deaf son attending Gallaudet College.

Rance Henderson, M. A., M. S. - Superintendent of the North Carolina School for the Deaf at Morganton and Director of the North Carolina Schools for the Deaf, a constellation of three residential schools with pre-school satellite programs.

Marjoriebell Holcomb, M. A. - Regional Field Agent for the Deaf-Blind Center in Delaware, Margaret S. Sterck School for the Hearing Impaired. Assistant Professor of Education, The University of Delaware. Deaf professional. Parent of two deaf sons, one a student at the MSSD.

Stanley Ikenberry, Ph. D., Panel Chairman - Senior Vice President for University Development and Relations and Professor of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University. Formerly, Dean of the College of Human Resources and Education at West Virginia University.

George Propp, Ed. D. - Assistant Director of the Special Office for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, the Center for Media and Materials at The University of Nebraska. Deaf professional. Parent of a deaf son attending Gallaudet College.

Rodney Tillman, Ed. D. - Dean of the School of Education, The George Washington University. Member, Advisory Committee of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf.

Carol J. Boggs, M. Ed., Staff Assistant to the Committee - Ph. D. candidate in Education at The University of Maryland. Formerly Planning Analyst, Gallaudet College.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Mission of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf

Public Law No. 89-694 authorized the establishment and operation of a model secondary school for the deaf which would

> ...provide day and residential facilities for secondary education of persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for college and other advanced study, and to provide an exemplary secondary school program to stimulate the development of similarly excellent programs throughout the nation...

Pursuant to the Law, the Agreement between Gallaudet College and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, defined in greater detail the mission of the authorized model secondary school. Such a school, according to the Agreement, was to provide

> ...day and residential facilities for secondary education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for college and other advanced study and to provide an exemplary comprehensive secondary school program for the deaf to stimulate the development of similarly excellent programs throughout the nation. The objectives of the School will be to prepare deaf persons for post-secondary education of various types; to prepare students to the maximum extent possible to be independent and contributing members of society at their respective levels of functioning upon completion of the program; to provide educational services that will meet the needs of the anticipated heterogeneous student body so that terminal and non-college-bound students can utilize or develop

potential skills and technical, vocational and trade pursuits; and in these and other respects to develop offerings of such excellence that they may be copied elsewhere.

Proceeding from the Law and the Agreement, the staff and faculty of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf developed a Statement of Philosophy and a series of goals, which have served as the foundation for the operation of the School and its programs. The Review Panel has studied carefully all of these documents—the Law, the Agreement, and the Statement of Philosophy--as well as the operating programs of the MSSD. In its review the Committee gave considerable attention to the degree of consistency apparent among these directive and policy statements and the various program components of the MSSD.

Observations

1. There is, in the opinion of the Review Panel, a high degree of consistency between the Law, the Agreement, the MSSD Statement of Philosophy, the program goals, and the operating program itself.

2. Gallaudet College and the MSSD are to be commended for the manner in which the mission has been implemented and the extent to which the School in a relatively short period of time has been able to make significant progress toward its goals.

3. The Panel was favorably impressed by the extent to which the staff and faculty of the MSSD are aware of the mission of the School and by their feelings of individual responsibility to bring the goals of the School to reality.

4. Under very severe constraints of time and space, the MSSD has synthesized materials, personnel, environment and other resources toward the goal of an exemplary, comprehensive secondary school for a very heterogeneous population.

This has been accomplished without compromising individual rights and professional privileges which are all too often trampled in the zeal to accomplish a mission.

5. The most concrete evidence of the commitment of the MSSD to its mission is the new physical structure taking form on the Gallaudet Campus. The new building represents the results of exhaustive investigation and research into every possible contingency, and a constant reappraisal of needs in the face of a dynamic and changing program. All of this has been accomplished without losing sight of the needs of students presently being served.

6. Heretofore the MSSD has been guided by a set of assumptions developed early in its operation from the various statements of its mission. The Philosophy and Goals statement developed during 1974 gives indication of being founded on this same set of assumptions. It is not clear to what extent the validity of these early ideas and assumptions have themselves been tested. The Operational Plan developed for FY 1976 suggests that consideration has been given to an internal needs assessment for short-range program decisions. The Review Panel did not see indication of a sufficient effort to tap systematically external as well as internal sources in a careful, long-range planning effort. Such planning should attempt to validate early basic assumptions and assess whether or not current practices and programs constitute the most appropriate interpretation of the mission with which the School is charged.

Recommendations

1. The Review Panel strongly recommends that greater attention be given to the wide dissemination of the MSSD mission and purpose. A broader knowledge of the mission and purpose of the MSSD, especially among other schools for the deaf throughout the nation, will prevent misunderstanding and enhance future efforts to influence effectively and work cooperatively with other professionals in the field.

2. It is recommended that mechanisms for an on-going needs assessment be developed so as to identify and order intermediate and long-range program priorities for the MSSD. Because such decisions can neither be made once for all time nor in ivy-towered isolation, the needs assessment effort should be designed as an integral part of the on-going instruction, development and dissemination program of the MSSD. Such a continuing dialogue utilizing a wide variety of external as well as internal sources will maximize the benefits to deaf students of the materials and methods being produced by the School.

3. An increased commitment should be made to long-range planning -- planning which encourages both orderly program development and the appropriate coordination of different aspects of the program in a comprehensive and effective fulfillment of the MSSD mission, and which provides at the same time flexibility for innovation and change as circumstances change.

4. Program and organizational design at MSSD should recognize that emphasis given different aspects of the MSSD mission will change as MSSD develops and matures and that growing attention to the MSSD mission as a "model" school will be required in the years ahead.

The Concept of "Model"

The "model" principle, set forth in both the Legislation and the Agreement, is not only a part of the name of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf, it is also an integral part of the mission of the School. The concept of "model" is not that of an ideal practice or theory operating under closely controlled conditions in a hothouse environment -- a phenomenon to be observed from a distance and somehow transported *in toto* to another setting. The concept of "model," as seen by MSSD, is a working laboratory, involving observer-participants from other secondary

schools for the deaf and others concerned with the education of the deaf. The "model" is seen as participatory and interactive in nature, rather than remote and observational. It foresees a constant flow of people in and out of MSSD, participating in many MSSD activities. It foresees a flow of people and tested materials from MSSD to the field as well. A "model" in this sense not only allows, but plans for and encourages, participation in process — an experience mutually beneficial both to the resident and the external professional. Each sees in a new way the problems of another setting; each is equipped with new tools relevant to particular needs.

Observations

1. The Review Panel strongly supports the concept of "model," cited above, as applied to and accepted by the Model Secondary School for the Deaf.

2. Inherent in the concept of "model" is the dissemination function. It is obvious that the staff and faculty of the MSSD recognize their responsibility in this area. There exists at the present time, however, no clearly defined dissemination strategy. In the current organization of the School, responsibility for the dissemination function is diffuse and implied rather than stated in the responsibilities of several program components of the School.

3. It is clear that the MSSD is intended to serve as a model for community interaction. Consumers of MSSD educational services must play an important role. Increased participation by parents and adult deaf persons could strengthen the program both internally and externally.

Recommendations

1. The Review Panel recommends that immediate attention be given to organization for the model or dissemination function. While general responsibility for the "model" aspect of the MSSD mission must continue to be shared by all, specific responsibility for the model or dissemination function should be explicitly

designated within the organizational structure. Development of short-term and long-range strategies for the creative dissemination of processes, products, and programs should be given early attention. The MSSD philosophy that "disseminatio means more than sending "things" out, but means bringing people in, is excellent and needs to be made operational.

2. The Panel recommends that mechanisms for parental involvement in the programs of the MSSD be developed so that parents can be involved in a meaningful way in the education of their deaf children.

Instructional Program

The MSSD is in the most comprehensive sense of the term an educational institution. Although it must be responsive to many facets of a broad mission, i must provide instructional programs of exemplary quality if other facets of its mission, such as serving as a model, are to be functional.

Observations

1. In the opinion of the Review Panel the MSSD has responded well to its charge to develop exploratory programs in the face of obviously severe limitation

2. The instructional program of the MSSD is to be commended for its flexibility and for the variety of learning experiences available to students.

3. The Review Panel supports the commitment of the MSSD to the individua student as the focus of its activity — his self esteem, his learning progress, a his total development as a productive person. The enthusiasm and commitment of t students themselves are witness to the feelings of self-worth gained from partici- pation in the MSSD program.

4. The Review Panel was impressed by the variety and organization of instructional materials, and by the evidence of creativity in teacher-designed materials.

5. Expectations for student performance in cognitive areas at MSSD may be somewhat compromised by a heavy emphasis on the effective elements of personal development.

6. Whereas the mechanisms for monitoring each student's progress in individualized learning appear to be working satisfactorily at the present time, these same methods for evaluating student progress may prove unwieldly as the number of students increases from 130 to 600.

Recommendations

1. The Review Panel recommends that the approach to developing a variety of alternative models for learning, as exemplified by the mini-school, be given increased attention in the future. To do so is to increase service both to students and to the model function and the larger national constituency.

2. It is recommended that continuing efforts be made to achieve and maintain balance between the affective--cognitive--motor areas of student development and the demands of a modern, complex society. Cognitive and affective growth must proceed in concert.

3. The Panel recommends that plans be initiated to develop adequate methods for monitoring individual student growth and development for larger numbers of students substantially beyond the current scale.

Curriculum Development

A central element in the MSSD program is that of curriculum development, and that MSSD devotes a very significant fraction of its resources to this function. Curriculum development must be integrated with all other aspects of the School program, for to a large extent it is the curriculum, in part or in whole, which will be "modeled," which will guide the instructional program, and which will require research and evaluation support.

Observations

1. In the opinion of the Review Panel, the concept of integrating the curriculum development and teaching functions is a healthy one that should be continued. Developers of curriculum should be viewed as both curriculum specialists and teachers, although they may not perform both tasks simultaneously.

2. The development of mini-courses is a commendable activity of great potential benefit to the field.

3. Current priorities have demanded the present emphases in curriculum design and development so as to meet the immediate needs generated in start-up phase of the MSSD. In the future, the dissemination function will become increasingly closely linked to curriculum development.

4. The Division of Curriculum Design and Media should now give greater attention to long-range goals, concentrating efforts in fewer projects, and in closely integrating its role with the other facets of the MSSD mission it serves.

Recommendations

1. The Review Panel recommends the development of mechanisms integral to the operating programs of the MSSD for the continuing assessment of the need for development of curricula as perceived in the field. Such assessment strategies should be interwoven with the regular design, development and dissemination efforts and should proceed in tandem with current curriculum activity, giving correction and guidance in process as well as pointing directions for the future. Data collected in the field, together with that generated internally, should form the basis from which longer term, integrated plans can be made for the design and development of curricula.

2. Products prepared from the on-going needs assessment should be designed in ways that permit them to be shared widely by people of varied abilities in diverse settings.

3. So as to better serve the field, it is recommended that those developing curricula be prepared to make a significant investment of time and effort in working with those who will be using the materials which are produced. For maximum benefit to the student, curriculum development and dissemination must include the training of the teacher, both in the field setting and on the campus of the MSSD in the most advantageous use of the materials placed in his or her hands.

Developmental Education

Similarly to any conventional secondary school, the MSSD must respond to students from a wide range of abilities and with many different personal priorities and goals. The MSSD, as a residential school, however, carries additional responsibilities not generally assumed by conventional secondary schools. As such, it is presented with many special problems, but also many unique opportunities.

Observations

1. The Review Panel recognizes that because of space limitations the interpretation of the admissions requirements as set forth in the Agreement has been rather rigorous. As space problems are eased with the opening of new facilities, it is the opinion of the Panel that there already exists sufficient flexibility in the Agreement to liberalize the entrance requirements without the necessity either to renegotiate or to modify the Agreement itself.

2. Those who entrust their deaf sons and daughters into the residential care of the MSSD have a right to expect an appropriate degree of "parenting" and a certain consistency with the "home." The encouragement of self reliance and

independence should not be fostered at the expense of the natural dependence inherent in differing degrees in every teenager.

3. The MSSD may wish to look at the organizational structure which places Career Education under the Division of Developmental Education. Such a scheme may, in a larger more complex setting, contribute to an unintended, and clearly artificial, separation of Career Education from the rest of the instructional process.

4. Education for the whole person requires that the goals of the residence hall staff be consistent with those of the instructional staff. Regular, effective interchange between the two program components will enhance efforts toward that end.

Recommendations

1. The Review Panel strongly recommends that the residence programs be given priority as a facet of the total educational effort of the MSSD.

2. The Panel recommends that immediate steps be taken to upgrade the educational environment in the residence hall. Readily available media and materials of various kinds in the residence hall can only serve to increase the effectiveness of the total educational program.

3. It is recommended that methods be developed and tested to relate living experiences and the goal of increased self development, and to document student growth.

Staff Development

MSSD is primarily people: students, staff, parents, and constituencies. Central among these groups to the future of MSSD is its staff.

Observations

1. The commitment of the MSSD staff to total communication is strongly endorsed by the Review Panel.

2. The Review Panel commends the emphasis on staff development and the design of a variety of activities to further personal and professional growth on the part of staff and faculty.

3. It is of great importance that staff development and staff evaluation be closely linked.

Recommendations

1. The Review Panel recommends that staff development processes and products be included as a major part of the dissemination or model program.

2. It is recommended that the staff development program be designed to insure that it meet the demands of growth and the new staff required with the projected increase of the student population to 600.

3. The Panel recommends that staff training efforts include maintenance, cafeteria, and other service workers, as well as professional, paraprofessional, and clerical workers.

Research and Evaluation

If MSSD is to serve its current and future students well, and if it is to share in a responsible way its products and processes with others, it must have an effective program of self assessment and product process evaluation. Both "formative" evaluation based on small scale tests of an emerging learning program and "summative" evaluation in which broad scale field tests are run before programs or products are ready for use, are essential.

Observations

1. The Review Panel generally supports the recommendations of the MSSD Advisory Committee in its study of the research and evaluation function.

2. There always exists a potential for conflict between the need to develop and deliver high quality educational programs on the one hand, and the need to evaluate and assess those programs on the other. While the Review Panel has not seen practical evidence of such conflict, instruction and the needs of students must, of course, take priority.

3. The research and evaluation program, its organization and staffing patterns, are dependent on the clarity with which its mission is set forth. The Review Panel saw the need for increased precision in the definition of the role of the Office of Research and Evaluation.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that first priority be given to a redefinition and clarification of the fundamental role and expectations for research and evaluation at MSSD.

2. It is recommended that the Office of Research and Evaluation develop strategies and mechanisms to work cooperatively with other agencies and institutions to encourage and facilitate research in deafness. The magnitude of the work to be done and the dearth of available resources demand cooperation rather than competition or duplication.

3. Because of the growing demand for accountability, it is recommended that the Office of Research and Evaluation broaden its research and evaluation functions to include institutional research and other efforts designed to provide data that will demonstrate to the various constituents of the MSSD (the Congress, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; students; parents; and the broader national constituencies) the impact being made by the programs of the School. More, the

research and development program should be inseparably related to the system for monitoring the individual progress of each student.

4. It is recommended that the research effort include not only conventional experimental designs and measurement methods, but also more of what might be called "action research." Indeed, evaluation and assessment, in contrast to conventional research, may better describe the needed role. Traditional research efforts, confined to instruments and methods already developed, will not meet the apparent needs of MSSD.

Organization, Administration, and Management

MSSD, as any complex organization, is dependent for its ultimate success on the quality of its organization structure, the skill of its administrators, and the overall effectiveness of its management.

Observations

1. The Review Panel recognizes the need for and commends a flexible evolutionary attitude toward organizational structure. There will be a continuing need to evaluate and evolve structure as the School continues to grow.

2. The Panel supports the use of mechanisms such as the team approach to management, MBO, and PPBS. While these methods do have limitations, they represent an obvious effort to deal with the need for increased accountability in education.

3. The existence of the MSSD as part of a larger complex of educational programs under the aegis of Gallaudet College provides an unusual opportunity for the vertical integration of education for deaf persons from the pre-school through the doctoral level. The nature of the present relationship appears, however, to be limited largely to fiscal administration. In the opinion of the Panel both the

College and the pre-college programs have much to gain from increased working ties, particularly in such areas as research, planning, and technical assistance.

4. The Panel is aware of the difficulties and ambiguities possible in a position which combines dual responsibilities such as those of Dean of Pre-College Programs and Director of the Model Secondary School for the Deaf. Whereas the function of the Director of the MSSD seems reasonably straightforward, that of the Dean of Pre-College Programs, particularly the role of this position as a Dean in the College Administration is perhaps not so clear. Further, the demands resulting from one individual carrying both responsibilities are such that other pre-college programs may not derive maximum benefit from the leadership of the Dean of Pre-College Programs.

Recommendations

1. The Review Panel recommends that an increased effort be made to describe educational effectiveness in terms of the financial costs related to achieving that effectiveness. The Panel also recommends careful cost accounting. Costs should be segregated by program activity and program component; and those costs associated with the broader roles of model, curriculum developer and evaluator, and the like, should be set apart from those related to the more basic role as a secondary school.

2. The Panel recommends that the sharing of management models and techniques be included in the dissemination effort.

3. The Panel recommends not only the sharing of management models by the MSSD, but also the dissemination of the actual plans and schedules derived from these processes. Such would be of direct interest and relevance to the field, i.e., goals for student performance and schedules for the delivery of curricula.

4. The Review Panel recommends that the administration of the College review the dual role now carried by the Dean of Pre-College Programs and Director

of the MSSD, giving attention to a clarification of the responsibilities of each role, and consideration to the benefits and possible disadvantages of separating these two functions, with each to be carried individually.

CONCLUSION

The Review Panel is aware that a study and report of this nature have obvious weaknesses. The brevity of the process may have contributed a certain tentativeness to our impressions in some areas and resulted in perhaps some omissions. Recognizing these limitations, however, the observations and recommendations have been candid and of necessity have tended to dwell more on potential weaknesses than on obvious strengths.

In summary, the review process did point up several areas to which the MSSD should give its attention. While clearly not encompassing all of the committee's recommendations, its principal concerns as expressed in this report fall largely in the following five areas.

1. There is a need for the MSSD to develop more definitively its "model" function and to employ throughout its programs a variety of dissemination strategies in order to maximize the benefits and impact of its processes and products.

2. It is important that emphasis be placed on an on-going process of needs assessment, utilizing multiple internal and external sources, as an integral part of its instructional and curriculum development program.

3. An increased commitment should be made to intermediate and long range planning.

4. In its instructional program the MSSD should be careful to maintain a proper balance between the cognitive and affective areas and should make available a wide variety of alternate models for learning.

5. It is highly desirable that the research and evaluation function be broadened so as to respond to multiple information requirements.

MSSD has made sound progress during its initial years. Its greatest challenge, however, lies ahead as a new facility and an expanded enrollment become

available, and a broader concept of its mission and constituencies comes into view. The fundamental direction upon which the School is set is consistent not only with its mission as defined in Law and formal Agreement, but consistent with social need. With the continuing dedication of its staff and continuing support from all those it is designed to serve, MSSD will surely realize the high hopes and dreams held by its founders and sponsors.